

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

Address by Edward J. Caldwell, State Supervisor, Office of Distribution,
 War Food Administration, before the Arizona Hotel
 Association, Tucson, Arizona,
 April 27, 1944

There isn't anything very original in the statement that everybody is interested in food, and I hesitate to preface my remarks with the comment that food is uppermost in the thoughts of everyone in this gathering. I am sure, however, that such is the case. When people find themselves in circumstances such that they are unable to get enough food---whether through poverty or because of no food being available---they are able to think of little else than the food they would like to have. The same applies to people who, although there is enough food and they have more than enough money to buy the food, are seriously concerned about some particular food they would like to have and are unable to obtain in unlimited quantities.

Because we are in a war, we find our food supplies limited. The limitation upon what we have calls for careful management, and I don't think anyone is in a better position to appreciate the need for good management of food supplies than you people in the hotel and restaurant business. Your job is to make what you have stretch to meet the demands of thousands and thousands of people who perhaps wouldn't be able to eat a certain meal if you didn't provide the service and the food---people away from home, people without homes, soldiers away from camp, travelers in the war effort---these are the ones who have only the hotels and restaurants to turn to when they must have food.

Your Government is vitally concerned with food management, too, and perhaps in these few moments I can give you some idea of what the Office of Distribution of the War Food Administration believes the food outlook for 1944 is, and what it expects of you in the way of good management of the food supplies available and to be available during the remainder of this year.

First, I think we can say without any hesitation whatever that there will be enough food for everybody in the United States. There will be enough quantitatively so that no one need ever leave the meal table with an empty feeling; there will be enough qualitatively so that all minimum nutritional requirements will be fulfilled. And let's remember that we civilians will have all this food despite first having made provisions for the millions of men and women in our armed forces.

To me the fact that there will be enough food for all and that it will be nutritionally adequate is the most important fact of all, but I think you will be most interested in the subject of what particular foods or types of foods are likely to be scarce. Whenever a certain food item is plentiful you can depend upon me to let you know about it. I probably don't have to mention cabbage, or eggs, or potatoes, to illustrate what I mean by telling you when there is a plentiful supply. Right now, if the War Food Administration hadn't worked out a plan to utilize an over-abundance of carrots from the Imperial Valley, for

dairy stock feed, I probably would be calling upon you to serve carrots for breakfast, lunch and dinner, with carrot juice, carrot salad and carrot pudding thrown in for good measure.

I realize, of course, that your primary concern is the adequacy of ration point allowances to accommodate your meal trade. It must have been welcome news to all of you when the Office of Price Administration removed cooking fats and oils from the ration list, because you thereby are enabled to use practically all of your red points for meat and butter.

Frequently when it comes to ration point worries, indications are that the blue points you must have to purchase canned, processed foods will become more of a problem, relatively speaking, than the "inadequacy" of red points. The quantities of canned fruits and vegetables available for civilian use out of this year's pack will be reduced drastically. This is because of greatly-increased needs of canned fruits and vegetables to meet overseas demands of our armed forces. Let's take a few examples.

From the 1944 pack, canners are required to set aside for war needs, a quantity of canned apricots, fruit cocktail, peaches, pears and pineapple equal to 70 per cent of their average production in 1942 and 1943. Now, the average pack of canned peaches for those two years was about 14 million, 200 thousands cases of No. 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ cans. This means that war needs will take about ten million cases from the 1944 pack. It is still a little too early in the season to make certain about how this year's crop of peaches will turn out; right now the California crop is giving every evidence of bumper proportions, but I heard about a hail storm they had over part of the peach belt last week that was one of those typical California stories---hail stones that wouldn't go through a ring one and a quarter inches in diameter!

Anyway, the quantity of canned peaches which will be available for civilian use out of the 1944 pack will be the difference between 10 million cases and the amount produced and canned. If we have a good crop, and canners are able to handle it, it might be that civilian supplies would be sufficient to justify a reduction in ration point values on canned peaches. But let's remember that first of all, 10 million cases have to go to the armed forces. So if the crop isn't too good, civilian supplies are likely to be so short that the ration point cost would go up!

The same applies to all the other fruits and vegetables which go into cans and which are needed in such great quantities for shipment to our fighting men overseas. Here is the list: Canned apples, applesauce, apricots, berries, cherries, figs, fruit cocktail, peaches, pears, pineapple juice, asparagus, lima beans, snap beans, beets, carrots, corn, peas, pumpkin, spinach, tomatoes, tomato catsup, tomato puree and tomato paste. The reservation percentages which apply, based on average production in 1942 and 1943, range all the way from 26 per cent in the case of tomato paste to 150 per cent in the case of carrots, with most of the items running well over 50 per cent. These requirements of the armed

forces make it easier to understand why ration point values for canned fruits and vegetables sometimes get rather "expensive".

But let's remember that there is always the alternative of frozen fruits and vegetables---ration free right now---which make thoroughly acceptable substitutes for most of the canned products. Restaurants unable to fill their requirements from available canned stocks or fresh produce should, if they are not already doing so, make arrangements for supplies of the fresh-frozen varieties. A lot of cold storage warehouse space is being cleared of these commodities right now to make room for more critical items, and I understand there are some bargains to be had in frozen fruits and vegetables.

You naturally are interested, too, in meat supplies and ration values. With all the speculation which has been taking place during the past couple of weeks, I find myself rather "on the spot" making this talk on the very date the OPA is scheduled to make its announcements about ration point changes for the month of May. But indications are that there will be perhaps a little more meat available for civilians this year than in 1943---especially pork. In the case of beef, there is some uncertainty, and the answer probably will lie in how evenly the marketing of beef cattle can be spread over the spring, summer and fall months. There is a natural tendency on the part of cattle producers to keep their stock on the range as long as possible, to take advantage of the more plentiful and cheaper grass feed. In fact, this holding tendency is causing some concern lest a heavy percentage of the marketable cattle be held on grass as long as possible---as long as there is any grass---and then be sent to market all at once late this summer and early this fall. Such a "run" would swamp slaughter facilities to an extent comparable with the glut of hogs during this past winter, and certainly would be the cause of much distress among producers and the signal for demands that ration points be lowered on beef to provide a bigger market.

In this connection, it would be well to recall that similar demands were made during the run of hogs to market a couple or three months ago. A lot of people seemed to think that if everybody could buy pork ration-free, the temporary "glut" would be eased. Apparently what they failed to take into account was the fact that slaughter facilities already were being operated at absolute maximum capacity in view of manpower and materials shortages. Taking the ration points off pork wouldn't have got a single hog more slaughtered, except a few which might have been killed on the farm and sold on the spot. So I'm not too optimistic about any considerable reduction in beef ration-point values. I think those of you who have made a study of the subject will agree that one of the responsibilities of rationing is to spread supplies of the various rationed foods as evenly as possible over the entire year. Point values have to take into account the anticipated over-all supplies available for civilian consumption. I don't think many of us would think it worthwhile to have a "feast" of beef for a couple of months this summer, and then have to go without entirely next spring.

Butter? It's about the same story. Again I must bear in mind that this is the day on which the so-called "prophecies" regarding a big reduction in butter ration points were supposed to come true. But I do

know that butter production is far below what it was at the same time last year, and there can't be justifiable optimism on the score of any permanent reduction in ration values. During April, the War Food Administration found it necessary to take only 10 per cent of the butter produced, as compared with the 30 per cent which was set aside for war needs last February, March and April. That was because the government still had about 20 million more pounds of butter on hand than it had expected to have. Some people would immediately say, "That proves that the government guessed wrong, and ration points for butter never should have gone so high." Well, the reason we did have more butter on hand than we had expected wasn't because the OPA or WFA guessed wrong. It was because the Nazis and the Japs guessed wrong. They didn't sink nearly so many of our ships carrying butter and other supplies as had been anticipated, so those butter reserves became available for use here at home. We bureaucrats haven't come to the point where we'll go out and dump 20 million pounds of butter in the ocean just to prove that we had made the proper estimates of what would be available here at home.

No, your government is doing the best job it knows how in seeing to it that you get every possible advantage which the fortunes of war throw our way. And it will be time enough to talk about reducing butter point values when the butter begins to back up in distributors' hands, and production prospects become brighter than they are right at this time.

Maybe this would be a good time to get a little bit "personal" and suggest a policy of frank honesty with your restaurant patrons on this subject of limitations on food supplies. What I mean is, it is entirely your own affair if you should decide that as a matter of policy you wouldn't serve butter with your meals. A lot of hotels have done that and, as I say, it's entirely their own business. What I do have to suggest is that in such an event you tell your patrons who question the lack of butter not: "We can't get any", but: "We're putting all our points into meat". I know there are a lot of limitations imposed by wartime regulations, and it's easy to find an excuse to blame almost anything onto the war, or the government. But I think you can do a better job of helping your government win this war, by being honest with yourself and with your patrons about government wartime regulations.

In the same breath I could mention ice cream. There are a lot of places I know where you can't buy real 100 per cent ice cream. Most of it comes mixed with sherbet or ice and the reason given again is: "Government regulations". Well, it's no such thing. The War Food Administration has limited the amount of milk solids which may be used in the manufacture of ice cream to 65 per cent of the base period in 1942. That's to conserve critically needed milk supplies. But it is the manufacturer's own decision that causes him to spread that 65 per cent milk solids over a 100 or 200 per cent gallonage, and therefore have to fill it out with sherbet or water ice. I don't want anyone to get the idea that I'm opposed to profit. The only point I want to bring out is that it would be far more truthful to explain that you're making limited supplies of ice cream---containing milk---stretch so that everybody can have at least a bite of real ice cream.

Well, I don't want to dwell on that subject. I didn't come here to give you folks a lecture. Let me tell you how the Office of Distribution of the War Food Administration is set up to give you a "lift" in the matter of shortages and surpluses of food which develop.

(Insert here your advisory committee set-up)

And I want to commend the hotels of Arizona for the job they are doing in making wartime problems at least "livable". I want you to know that the facilities of the Office of Distribution (List state and area offices) are open to you in meeting the problems you encounter in food shortages. I want to feel that I can count on you to pitch in and help us when a temporary surplus of some commodity exists, by giving it extra emphasis on your menus.

We'll all have enough to eat, which is something few nations can say. With the cooperation of all, we can make that "enough" stretch into "plenty".

*H.
H.*

